

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-13, 15-20 and 22-68 have been rejected. Reconsideration of the Final Office Action is requested based on the remarks in § 103 Remarks section below.

§ 112 Rejections

The Office has rejected claims 59, 62, and 66 under § 112 first paragraph. Claims 59, 62, and 66 have been canceled without prejudice.

In response to the Office's rejection of claim 10 under § 112 second paragraph, the previous response stated that to the extent necessary, the recitation of MPEG should be limited to those variations of MPEG known at the time of filing. In the current action, however, the Office maintains its request for specific versions and dates of the MPEG recommendations. The Office is requested to reconsider its position in that one of ordinary skill could readily determine specific MPEG recommendation versions with a date based on the filing date of the present application. At the continued request of the Office, the information will be provided.

§ 103 Rejections

The Office has maintained its rejection of independent claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Boyce in view of Takahashi. Reconsideration is respectfully requested for the reasons indicated below.

There is no motivation to combine Boyce and Takahashi. The Office relies on the combination of Boyce in view of Takahashi to reject Claims 1 and 11. Specifically, it is admitted by the Office that Boyce does not disclose an encoder that uses motion vectors saved in memory, and instead relies upon Boyce in view of Takahashi to reject claim 1. Even if the combination of references disclosed all elements, which is not admitted herein, the nature of the problems solved by Boyce and Takahashi are different, and therefore no suggestion or motivation to combine the references is provided. Specifically, Boyce identifies reducing memory in decoders at column 2, lines 1-25, as a problem to be resolved in obtaining a low cost decoder. Takahashi identifies a problem relating to maintaining high quality images transmitted

by a television broadcast station (see text beginning column 3, line 34). The Office states that one of ordinary skill "having the Boyce et al and Takahashi et al references in front of him/her and the general knowledge of video transcoders, would have had no difficulty in providing" the recited invention. However, given the different nature of the problems being solved, absent some other showing, there is no motivation for an inventor to have the references in front of them, let alone to combine them.

The Office states at page 6 of the Action that one of ordinary skill "having the Boyce et al and Takahashi et al references in front of him/her and the general knowledge of video transcoders, would have had no difficulty in providing" the recited invention. References are respectfully requested to be provided in support of the general knowledge of video transcoders at the time of the invention, as relied upon in rejecting the recited invention.

The combination of Boyce and Takahashi destroys the purpose of the invention of Boyce. Specifically, Boyce is directed to a decoder having a reduced size memory buffer to provide a low cost decoder that is not capable of providing an HDTV picture quality (column 4, beginning at line 31). Takahashi discloses a system with two encoders that require HDTV quality be maintained (column 7, beginning at line 63). Combining the teachings of Takahashi, which requires HDTV quality, with Boyce prohibits implementation of cost saving features required in Boyce, such as reduced memory size. The combination further destroys the purpose of Takahashi, in that Boyce discloses reducing the resolution of received HD pictures prior to decoding thereby reducing the complexity of later processing stages of the decoder. Takahashi requires maintaining full HDTV video decode (output to 28 in FIG. 2B, and output to 40 in FIG. 2C). The data reduction of Boyce prior to decoding destroys the ability of Takahashi to maintain full HDTV video as recited.

For at least these reasons a prima facie rejection of claim 1 has not been made. Similarly, a prima facie rejection of claims depending from claim 1 has not been made. Withdrawal of the rejections under § 103 based on the combination of Boyce and Takahashi is solicited.

Claim 11 recites determining a plurality of first motion vectors associated with a compressed first video image, storing the plurality of first motion vectors (a stored plurality of

first motion vectors), generating one or more second motion vectors based on the stored plurality of first motion vectors, and generating a compressed second video image based upon one or more second motion vectors, wherein the second video image is a scaled representation of the first video image. For similar reasoning put forth previously, there is insufficient motivation to combine Boyce and Takahashi as recited to arrive at the limitations of claim 11.

For at least this reason a prima facie rejection of claim 11 has not been made. Similarly, a prima facie rejection of claims depending from claim 11 has not been made. Withdrawal of the rejections under § 103 based on the combination of Boyce and Takahashi is solicited

In addition, to the arguments presented above, those claims depending from claims 1 and 11 provide additional non-obvious subject matter. For example, claims 9, 16, and 18 recite representing a specific motion vector of the second motion vectors by selecting a most frequently used motion vector. Samad does not disclose representing a specific motion vector in this manner, but instead identifies a set of vectors to obtain a global motion vector, not a most recently used motion vector. Claims 57, 58, 64 and 65 disclose a hard drive. The Office recites Vainsencher as a reference to be combined with Boyce and Takahashi to reject claims 57, 58, 64 and 65. The Office recognizes that Vainsencher stores motion vectors in SDRAM and not a hard drive, but asserts that that one of ordinary skill would use a hard drive in place of SDRAM. It is well recognized that the speed of a hard drive is significantly less than that of SDRAM and typically not suitable for normal transcoding operations. No motivation, other than improper hindsight, has been identified to use the hard drive of Vainsencher as recited in the claims. Claim 63 recites the decoder and encoder being part of a transcoder processor. The Office asserts such a processor disclosed by the combination of Boyce and Takahashi at FIG. 2. However, Takahashi clearly indicates beginning at column 7, line 63 that FIG. 2 as a whole does not represent a processor, in that portions 2B and 2C do not need to event be in the same building as 2A. There is no suggestion that an of the components of FIG. 2 disclose a processor as recited.

For at least these reasons, reconsideration by the Office is requested.


The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or

credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-1835.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action by the Applicant(s) would be desirable for placing this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is requested to issue a formal Notice of Allowance for all pending claims. If, for any reason, the Office is unable to allow the Application on the next Office Action, and believes a telephone interview would be helpful, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney or agent.

Respectfully submitted,

5-10-04
Date


J. Gustav Larson, Reg. No. 39,263
Attorney for Applicant(s)
TOLER, LARSON & ABEL, L.L.P.
P.O. Box 29567
Austin, Texas 78755-9567
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5452 (fax)